1	Stephen J. Thomas (Bar No. 120751) Tim C. Lin (Bar No. 263885)					
2	THE THOMAS LAW GROUP					
3	17800 Castleton Street, Suite 605 City of Industry, CA 91748 Telephone: (626) 771-1005 Facsimile: (626) 628-1905					
4						
5						
6	Attorneys for Defendant					
7	Twin Tiger Footwear, Inc.					
8						
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
11						
12	AIRWAIR INTERNATIONAL LTD., a) Case No. 12-cv-04905-PSG company of the United Kingdom,) Honorable Paul S. Grewal					
13	Plaintiff,) ANSWER TO COMPLAINT					
14	vs.					
15 16	TWIN TIGER FOOTWEAR, INC.; and ODES 1-50,					
17	Defendants.					
18						
19	Defendant Twin Tiger Footwear, Inc. through its counsel, Stephen J. Thomas, in answer to					
20	plaintiff's Complaint, admit, deny, or otherwise allege as follows:					
21	1. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 1 of					
22	the Complaint, and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.					
23	2. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint.					
24	3. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint.					
26	4. Defendant admits plaintiff has sued defendants DOES 1 through 50. Defendant lacks					
27						
28	information and belief sufficient to form a response to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph					
∠ 0						

27

28

4 of the Complaint and on that basis denies the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint.

- 5. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
- 6. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint.
- 7. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
- 8. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 8 of the Complaint and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.
- 9. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 9 of the Complaint and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.
- 10. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 10 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.
- 11. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 11 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
- 12. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 12 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
- 13. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
- 14. Defendant lacks information and belief sufficient to form a response to Paragraph 14 of the Complaint, and on that basis, denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.
 - 15. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint.
 - 16. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.
 - 17. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint.
 - 18. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint.
 - 19. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint.
 - 20. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint.

21.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of the Complaint.				
	FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF				
22.	Defendant realleges and incorporates by reference each of its responses to Paragraphs 1				
through 21 o	f the Complaint				
23.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of the Complaint.				
24.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of the Complaint.				
25.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of the Complaint.				
26.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of the Complaint.				
	SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF				
27.	Defendant realleges and incorporates by reference each of its responses to Paragraphs 1				
through 26 of the Complaint.					
28.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 28 of the Complaint.				
29.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.				
	THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF				
30.	Defendant realleges and incorporates by reference each of its responses to Paragraphs 1				
through 29 of the Complaint.					
31.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 31 of the Complaint.				
32.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 32 of the Complaint.				
33.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 33 of the Complaint.				
34.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 34 of the Complaint.				
35.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 35 of the Complaint.				
	FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF				
36.	Defendant realleges and incorporates by reference each of its responses to Paragraphs 1				
through 35 of the Complaint.					
37.	Defendant denies the allegations contained in this Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.				

- E. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraph E of the Complaint or any relief whatsoever.
- F. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraph F of the Complaint or any relief whatsoever.
- G. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraph G of the Complaint or any relief whatsoever.
- H. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraph H of the Complaint or any relief whatsoever.
- I. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraph I of the Complaint or any relief whatsoever.
- J. Defendant denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief requested in Paragraph J of the Complaint or any relief whatsoever.

FURTHER ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

By way of further Answer and as affirmative defenses, defendant denies that it is liable to plaintiff on any of the claims alleged and denies that plaintiff is entitled to damages, treble or punitive damages, equitable relief, attorneys' fees, costs, pre-judgment interest or to any relief whatsoever, and states as follows:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to State a Claim)

48. The Complaint, on one or more counts set forth therein, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Fair Use)

49. The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of fair use.

1		THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
2		(First Sale Doctrine)
3	48.	The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by the first sale
4	doctrine.	
5		FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
6 7		(Functionality)
8	49.	The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, on the basis that any
9	marks and us	se of marks at issue are functional.
10		FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
11		(Innocent Infringement)
12	50.	The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because any
13		-
14	Imringement	e, if any, was innocent.
15		SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
16		(Statutes of Limitations)
17	51.	The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by applicable statute
18	of limitations	S.
19		SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
20		(Laches)
21 22	52.	Plaintiff's claims are barred by laches, in that Plaintiff has unreasonably delayed efforts
23	to enforce its	s rights, if any, despite its full awareness of defendant's actions.
24		EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE
25		(Non-Infringement)
26	53.	Defendant has not infringed any applicable trademarks under federal or state law.
27		
28		

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	ı	

28

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Causation)

54. Plaintiff's claims against defendant are barred because plaintiff's damages, if any, were not caused by defendant.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Damage)

55. Without admitting that the Complaint states a claim, there has been no damage in any amount, manner or at all by reason of any act alleged against defendant in the Complaint, and the relief prayed for in the Complaint therefore cannot be granted.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unclean Hands)

56. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Lack of Irreparable Harm)

57. Plaintiff's claims for injunctive relief are barred because plaintiff cannot show that it will suffer any irreparable harm from defendant's actions.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Adequacy of Remedy at Law)

58. The alleged injury or damage suffered by plaintiff, if any, would be adequately compensated by damages. Accordingly, plaintiff has a complete and adequate remedy at law and is not entitled to seek equitable relief.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to Mitigate)

59. The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because of a failure to mitigate damages, if such damages exist.

8

6

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2526

27

28

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Duplicative Claims)

60. Without admitting that the Complaint states a claim, any remedies are limited to the extent that there is sought an overlapping or duplicative recovery pursuant to the various claims against defendant.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Fraud)

61. The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by fraud on the United States Patent & Trademark Office.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Third-Party Use)

62. The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by reason of other parties' use of any marks at issue.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Actions of Others)

63. The claims made in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because defendant is not liable for the acts of others over whom it has no control.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Punitive Damages)

64. Defendant alleges that no punitive or exemplary damages should be awarded arising out of the claims made in the Complaint under the law of the United States and California because: (i) any recovery of punitive or exemplary damages arising out of the claims made in the Complaint would constitute the imposition of a criminal fine or penalty without the substantive or procedural safeguards guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and by

Case5:12-cv-04905-PSG Document17 Filed01/24/13 Page9 of 10

1 Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution; (ii) the imposition of any punitive or exemplary 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 WHEREFORE, defendant prays for judgment as follows: 10 1. 11 2. 12 with prejudice. 13 3. 14 expenses; and 1.5 4. 16 17 18 19 /s/ Stephen J. Thomas_ By: 20 21 Dated: January 24, 2013 22

damages in this lawsuit would constitute an excessive fine or penalty under Article I, Section 17 of the California Constitution; (iii) any such award is precluded or limited pursuant to Section 3294 of the California Civil Code or the United States Constitution and the due process clause; and (iv) punitive damages would violate the United States and California Constitutions and common law because such an award is based from procedures that are vague, open-ended unbound in discretion, arbitrary and without sufficient constraints or protection against arbitrary and excessive awards. That plaintiff takes nothing by way of its Complaint; That the Complaint, and each and every purported claim for relief therein, be dismissed That defendant be awarded its costs of suit incurred herein, including attorneys' fees and For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. THE THOMAS LAW GROUP

Stephen J. Thomas,

Attorney for Defendant Twin Tiger Footwear, Inc.

23

24

25

26

27

28

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Defendant Twin Tiger Footwear, Inc. hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims. THE THOMAS LAW GROUP /s/ Stephen J. Thomas_ Stephen J. Thomas, By: Attorney for Defendant Twin Tiger Footwear, Inc. Dated: January 24, 2013